

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DDI/OEA  
✓

4 September 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

FROM:

[Redacted]

Deputy Director of East Asian Analysis

STAT

SUBJECT:

OEA Views on the Human Resource Modernization and  
Compensation Task Force Preliminary Report

### SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

1. In general, OEA personnel did not see the need for a change in our pay system as radical as that proposed by the Task Force. There were some suggestions for a more moderate reform, which are appended. Most people in OEA support several other aspects of the Task Force proposals, including increased--and more relevant--training, a dual track system, and a revised benefits package.

### GENERAL COMMENTS

2. Overall, OEA managers and analysts were not persuaded of the need for a major change in our pay system. Several people cited the old saw that "If it isn't broken, don't fix it." Others went further, trying to decide whether--even if the current system is not flawed--it could be improved. In the latter case, most concluded that the nature and extent of the problems with the GS system were not significant enough to warrant a change of the magnitude proposed by the task force.

--This belief apparently was reinforced by the China Lake presentation, where it was made clear that they were happy with their new system largely because their previous system had been so deeply flawed. No one in OEA was prepared to argue that, in the CIA's case, the game was worth the candle.

3. On the contrary, most within OEA worried that although the new system might provide certain benefits, it would also bring with it numerous new problems. Specifically, OEA managers appear convinced that under the new system, performance appraisal would be incredibly complicated and time consuming.

STAT  
25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

--OEA personnel agreed and the analysts, in particular, argued that the managers were unlikely to give the new system the time required, thus defeating it before it starts.

4. Numerous people also expressed their belief that teamwork, peer review, mentoring, and professionalism were the hallmarks of the DI work style. If we turn to a system based on cash, most worry that morale will suffer, that undue emphasis on money will destroy the organization as we know it.

--OEA agrees completely with the task force's analysis that "Employees driven primarily by money do not work for CIA." But OEA employees then asked, why use money to remedy a perceived problem?

--If we truly do face problems with recruitment and retention, raise people's pay or allot more money for bonuses under the current system. If as is rumored, the new system will require more money, use that money to improve our current system.

5. On the benefits side, most people in OEA thought that the new proposals looked attractive, but no one could understand why we had to adopt a new pay system in order to reform our benefits package.

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS

6. OEA personnel also responded to the 16 points of the task force proposal:

a. Pay and Classification Structure

Bands: Many people were troubled by the task force's statement that "Each occupational panel came to the conclusion that its occupation did not line up neatly with existing GS grades." This was criticized as being patently untrue. According to the several OEA personnel who participated on a number of different occupation panels, the panels were instructed to come up with a system that was different from the current one. Thus, the results of their labors was not an indictment of the GS system, but a reflection of the instructions they were given.

OEA personnel agreed with the statement that "The third systemwide constraint, and the one that would remain, is availability of funding." Given this important problem, and the extent to which it is key to any successful implementation, OEA personnel were skeptical about the feasibility of the proposed new pay scheme.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

One senior manager is enthusiastic about the flexibility that a banded system would give him, but the others, as well as the analysts, opposed the notion outright. There were several aspects to this criticism:

--To collapse what is now a range that runs from GS-07 to GS-15 into five bands would make promotions rarer, and therefore, more momentous. Such a move would create more attention to grade than is currently the case, with an attendant adverse impact on morale.

--Promotions are frequently as important symbolically as they are financially. Reducing the number of promotions so sharply--and replacing them with monetary awards--will replace a successful managerial method of rewarding high performance with one that most believe will have a negative effect.

Incentive Pay: There was some acceptance of the notion of abolishing step increases and augmenting bonuses. Several people opined that this could be done under the current system. Several others noted, however, that this is true only if managers were willing to withhold periodic step increases, which most believe is not likely. No clear consensus on this point emerged.

b. Performance Evaluation System

Performance Plan: There was widespread criticism of this proposal. Most people argued that it was an attempt to standardize something that will remain subjective regardless. Several people noted that we had just abolished AWP's, and wondered why we were reinstituting them, albeit under a different name.

Performance Evaluation: The proposal to change from five levels to seven elicited little comment. Those who did respond viewed the change as cosmetic. There is apparently no belief in OEA that current PARs are inflated.

There was, however, considerable concern that, if the new pay system were adopted, tying the PAR so directly to incentive pay would place too much pressure on the rating process and undercut any value a new performance evaluation system might have.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

c. Career Development System

Handbooks: The notion of handbooks was generally seen as a silly idea with no merit whatever.

Career Development Plan: Automated vacancy notices are long overdue.

Training: No one in OEA could determine the relevance of this proposal to the overall package. (See below, #8)

Training Availability: Also seen as completely unrelated to the rest of the exercise; if this has merit, it can be done on its own.

Dual Track: There was widespread support for this proposal but, again, no one could determine why it could not be enacted on its own, as the recent Layton panel suggested.

Promotions: (See comments on #1, above)

d. Benefits Program

Flexible Benefits: Although there was widespread support within OEA for a new benefits package, there was also a good deal of disappointment that there had been so little work done on this part of the proposal. Most people felt that they needed more details, but support the notion in general.

Leave Conversion: Found considerable support in our office.

Educational Assistance: This proposal looked good to those with children, but was seen as expensive and unfair by others.

Staffing Management Tools: These proposals triggered little discussion within OEA.

e. Data Processing Support

System Controls: Not discussed.

Projection Tools: Not discussed.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

7. As for specific recommendations, various people in OEA wrestled with the idea of trying to win the purported benefits from pay banding without abolishing the current system completely. These included proposals to abolish periodic step increases and cost-of-living increases. The money would then go into a pot to be used to reward satisfactory and better performers.

8. Under the current budget system, the money would not automatically be transferred (to the bonuses) to office personal service funds, but the system presumably could be changed.

--If there were a way to use personal services moneys more flexibly, most OEA managers would welcome the opportunity to do so.

--This is admittedly only one part of what is a far reaching proposal, but it would allow us to reward (and "punish") employees more selectively.

9. OEA also discussed the notion of "banding without bands." This might involve another compromise, whereby certain ranges of the GS scale would be collapsed. One such idea involved the lumping of GS-07 to GS-09, GS-10 to GS-12, and GS-13 to GS-14 into three "bands." This has the merit of simplifying the system without throwing the entire thing overboard. It would also be less difficult for people to understand, and would hence be much less terrifying than complete abolition of the GS system. ✓

--People noted that in the China Lake experiment, the new levels were still defined in terms of GS levels, which apparently eased the transition somewhat.

STAT

cc:

STAT

26 August 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

FROM:  Director  
Current Production and Analytic Support

STAT

SUBJECT: My View of the Human Resources  
Task Force Draft

1. I have deep-seated skepticism about the Task Force's recommendations. I frankly do not believe that our Office of Personnel and Office of Finance can administer the sort of system that is proposed in the preliminary report. My negative feeling was reinforced by two events that occurred as I began pulling my thoughts together in preparation for drafting this memorandum. First, I was interrupted by my personnel officer, who wanted me to sign a memorandum in order to enable a new employee to receive her paycheck, which had not been issued by the Office of Finance. Shortly thereafter, an employee who had transferred from SOVA indicated that his pay slip was still going to the SOVA Administrative Staff six to eight weeks after he joined CPAS. With this sort of performance, I simply do not believe the administrative offices can implement such wide-sweeping changes in the personnel system.

2. I understand that the Task Force, during early deliberations, looked at how some corporations managed their "human resources." In most cases, I am told, successful corporations deal with these matters in a more coherent way than we. If we are about to embark on such a grand experiment, I believe we would have to consider serious modification to the Agency's infrastructure. As I just learned, payroll has been transferred to the control of the Office of Personnel--presumably to correct any mismatches that occur ostensibly because the related functions are at present under different administrations. I will have to reserve judgment, but I believe that the problems run deeper and may require more than organizational realignment.

3. I recommend that a number of these proposals be implemented in those DA Offices concerned with human resource management--OTE, OP, OF. This would afford the opportunity to work out any bugs, and we all could observe the way in which the proposals operate. Moreover, if the proposals accomplish their objectives, those offices will

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

attract and hold good people and become more efficient and responsive. At that point, with realistic expectations, with a roadmap for implementation, and with a strengthened infrastructure, we might risk the rest of the Agency.

4. In addition, I sense that this group (with the exception of [redacted] is trying to cram this system down our throats and I resent it. The report attempts blatantly to sell the new system, and in so doing it distorts some facts. Primary among the distortions is the implication that few of the problems can be addressed without junking the current system and starting over. If you look carefully at Table 1--which appears to be designed to do just that--you find that all but one of the problem areas can be addressed without banding and with authority we already possess, as modest amendments to our current system. That, in essence, is what I think we should do -- enact as many of the good features of the draft report as possible under the GS system.

5. I am strongly against several of the recommendations made by the Task Force.

- I do not believe that we can implement the proposal of pay-for-performance. I do not see how we can properly evaluate personnel in order to determine pay. I vividly recall sitting in a Career Service Panel meeting trying to place employees in rank order, which did not work. On one occasion, I found myself trying to explain to an employee why she ranked 17th among employees of her grade in OSR. I could readily have explained why her performance placed her in a group, certainly not where she specifically ranked among the 33.
- I do not believe we have enough people to allow the dual-track system to work.
- As regards occupational training, I would hate to see OTE in a position of telling us what sort of training our people need.
- As one who has finished educating his children, I believe the educational benefit package is discriminatory and I am opposed to it. It discriminates not only against those without children, but also against minorities who do not have children in college. In fact, the whole array of flexible benefits favors the upper- and middle-class households, especially two-income

families. This is, moreover, an area where the IRS will have a say: if benefits become too tangible and are too easily equated with dollars, they are ripe to become taxable compensation.

6. I would hope we could pick and choose from some of these recommendations because I strongly like some of them.

-- I like the proposal to use Personal Services funding to structure an office. This would afford me flexibility to configure the office on the basis of efficiency rather than base the structure on a fixed table of organization.

-- I believe too that leave conversion for all is worthwhile. I would advocate the accumulation of all leave above 80 hours per year.

-- I support all of the recommendations concerning sick leave and a sick leave bank.

7. I am ambivalent about the "banding" proposal. In some areas it would simply recognize the existing situation--in our Cartography Center, for example, we have entry-level, apprentice, journeyman, and expert/senior cartographers, as well as managers. I can also see one category of problem that occasionally crops up in the Directorate and that might be ameliorated with banding. In areas that require special expertise--e.g., computers, engineering, economics--we sometimes hire entry-level individuals at journeyman wages so as to compete in the scarce labor market. When we do competitive rankings in that grade, however, these new hires are at a disadvantage and rank low. Banding could provide an alternative: a broad entry-level pay band that permits paying what it takes to attract applicants, but also allows us to keep them in the novice/apprentice category without disadvantage to their ranking.

8. In addition, I strongly favor several ideas that came out of CPAS. I believe, in particular, that some evaluation of shift-work stress should be used toward qualifying service much like CIARDS. I would support all of the recommendations made by CPAS personnel.

9. Finally, I believe the preliminary report was well vetted in the Office. Joe understood and explained it well. I sensed a basic but unemotional skepticism on the part of all with whom I talked about the proposal. I guess my biggest disappointment lies in the revelation--noted by



Joe in his memorandum and indicated by everyone with whom I talked--of a distrusting attitude about the ability of managers at all levels throughout the office to implement such a system fairly.



STAT

25 August 1987

**MEMORANDUM FOR:** Deputy Director for Intelligence

**FROM:** [REDACTED] Deputy Director  
Current Production and Analytic Support

**SUBJECT:** Human Resources Task Force Recommendations

**REFERENCE:** Preliminary Report--July 1987  
Proposed Pay, Personnel Management,  
and Compensation System

STAT

1. **Summary**--Response to the referenced proposals ranged from reserved skepticism to mild enthusiasm; most who commented were passively positive. A recurring theme was modest apprehension that the execution would not live up to the promise of the document. A distressing number expressed distrust of managers and doubted their fairness. Many recognized the need for additional resources and asked whether they would be forthcoming. Managers recognized that some of the proposals--pay for performance, in particular--could be onerous. With respect to "banding," a number of CPAS employees felt additional occupational specialties would have to be developed to encompass their skills and their positions. Another recurrent theme--perhaps unique to CPAS because of our 'round-the-clock operation--was the suggestion that benefits, bonuses, et al be computed taking into account not only base pay, but also overtime, night, holiday, and weekend differentials. Few shared my own view that it would be nice to define better the objectives and the ways in which we might measure our attainment of them, or lack thereof.

2. **Soliciting comments in CPAS** involved several steps and relied heavily on first-level supervisors. The report was distributed widely as was a memorandum from you that laid out the process by which comments would be forwarded. This message was reiterated several successive weeks in our staff meetings and circulated officewide in CPAS Staff Notes. A note went to all supervisors in the Office emphasizing their responsibility for soliciting comments from their employees and a series of roundtables was held with all first-line supervisors to reemphasize their responsibilities and answer their questions. Written responses passed from first-level supervisors, through the Office management chain, to me. Raw responses, kept on file as backup, were synthesized into this

memorandum, which was circulated so employees could see the feelings of their colleagues and correct misrepresentations. This synthesis is presented feature by feature, followed by conclusory paragraphs that cover general sentiments and concludes with ideas submitted by CPAS employees. These last I particularly commend to your attention (cf. paras 44 ff).

### **Funding Control With Classification Delegated to Directorates**

3. This was viewed positively by some who appreciated that the flexibility the system offers is good. "ABOUT TIME!!!" said one employee, "please keep this point even if all else fails." Here, too, distrust of managers crept in, however, and one employee pointed out that such changes "could define groundwork for unfair/subjective practice."

4. One respondent doubted managers "could effectively manage the proposed system ... thereby, negating the flexibility that the system is supposed to provide."

### **Use of Personal Services Funding Only (not position ceiling or average grade) to Structure the Work Force**

5. A distrust of "managers" was evidenced in reactions to this proposal. In the words of one employee, "I don't really like the idea of a manager's being able to adjust personnel numbers. Perhaps a panel?" Another said, "The one disturbing aspect of this idea is that headroom could be traded for number of personnel. This is precisely the type of change we would not like to see being made easily."

### **Pay and Classification Structure**

6. Although many comments were positive, those that were negative generally stemmed from a distrust of managers. Said one employee: "I am ambivalent/suspicious of the proposed pay and classification structure--it might be more dependent on subjective and opinionated managers. Favoritism could run rampant."

7. Questioned, too, was the source of additional funds, as well as the DA's competence to administer a new system. As one employee put it, "the Office of Finance is now hard put to administer the GS pay system that is quite simple and with which they have had 40 years of experience ... hardly a pay period passes when the CPAS Admin Section

does not have to intervene with payroll to get several employees paid." Brought into question, too, was the competence of the Office of Personnel to "assume the functions the Agency would take over from the Office of Personnel Management."

8. **Feature 1: "Banding"** had its supporters, detractors, and deriders. A modest majority of the respondents appeared to be in favor. One employee suggested that such a system "seems to be a good one, especially if, as the study indicates, it can be implemented with minimal cost and upset." Another employee felt that by, making fewer divisions, each would take on greater significance; he disliked the hierarchical nature of the proposal. Another felt that "the concept of banding is even more likely to keep women in low-paying jobs than is the GS system [because?] the gov't in general and CIA in particular do better than the private sector." Some noticed the discrepancy between the premise--that CIA personnel do not work primarily for money but for other forms of recognition--and the relative infrequency of movement from band to band.

9. Inasmuch as many CPAS occupational categories are not obviously represented (yet) in the plan, a number of questions arose: How many specialties would there be in our Cartography, Design and Publishing Group alone? If CDP personnel were, instead, part of a broader occupational group, say analyst, would they be noncompetitive and always in the lower 50 percent? Would career specialties be administered within an office or across offices and/or directorates?

10. Personnel falling under the Operations Center, too, felt they did not necessarily fit into a DI-analytic mold and worried whether "DI analysts ... are the best representatives for defining an occupationally based pay band for OPSCTR personnel."

11. Some questioned whether "the occupational models for the lesser salaried occupations [would get] full professional attention."

12. Others felt that, if adopted, banding should not be too rigid: "with adequate justification, employees should be allowed to skip levels within occupationally defined bands."

13. CIA-controlled "market pricing" led one employee to characterize the proposal as "a combination of wishful thinking, and the present system ... in fact, a complete break with the GS is not possible because OPM will evaluate our system against the GS [and calculate] a comparison

formula." Another employee pointed out that "market-pricing surveys haven't done much to elicit comparable raises over the years from Congress."

14. Other employees suggested that, "after pay scale comparisons are provided, mechanisms should be provided for employees to bridge to other occupations if their current field is overcrowded or has limited potential."

15. One component that understood the promise of market-pricing was our TV Center, which wanted to be sure that any panel that would determine comparable pay for "TV positions include experts from outside the Agency ... [because] our Center's employees must meet a broader range of professional requirements ... [and we want to ensure] true comparability with the compensation being offered in the commercial market."

16. Operations Center personnel, among others, who work other than normal duty hours wanted to be sure that "a new system will not eliminate differentials (or will include them as part of one's salary in the new pay band system)."

17. **Feature 2: Incentive Pay** drew mixed reviews. Some felt that, if announced, as are promotions now, friction would result among employees in the same office. Another argued against "a system in which annual performance awards replace (in any degree) promotions as a tangible expression of Agency recognition of exceptional employee performance." Others pointed out that it "automatically establishes a 50 percent failure rate." Some worried that, "if relatively new employees are ranked fully satisfactory but get no bonus, they will feel like failures from the outset, before they have had a chance to develop any confidence, thus making failure a self-fulfilling prophecy."

18. Management's integrity was brought into focus by some who questioned "how equitable the new system will be compared with the old system. Incentives and bonuses are pluses, but will they be allocated in a fair, objective manner, and will there be money available during times of tight budgets?"

19. Some noted that "pay for performance would be a manager's nightmare [and] competitiveness spawned by pay for performance would stifle cooperation among peers--somewhat of a siege mentality." Others pointed out that "this will put so much additional pressure on a supervisor to inflate employees PAR ratings that we will return to the days when

all employees receive a 6 on the PAR or employees will be reluctant to accept supervisory positions." Notwithstanding, some felt that it offered a "better deal for employees who really produce."

20. Some personnel in our Operations Center "think this is a great idea ... [and] agree that the current system for awarding bonuses is underutilized and take for granted that a primary reason for this is the bureaucracy that a manager must go through to get such an award pushed through."

### **Performance**

21. **Feature 3: Performance Plan**--"An excellent idea. Always has been ... LOI, AWP ... IN THEORY ... but what makes it different this time?" asks one employee. Others asked: "How can performance plans and evaluations be made objective enough to establish and defend rankings of people?" If they are customized, "what ensures some degree of consistency?" On a more positive note, one employee felt the automation aids might make for "fairer reviews, especially for employees with managers who lack the flair of wordsmanship." Another employee commended an NSA system, which reportedly rewards those who attain language and academic proficiency and degrees and works "fairly well."

22. **Feature 4: Performance Evaluation** was cited by one employee as "sadly in need of reform--managers hate them and employees ignore them except for a few weeks right around reporting time." On a creative note, the same employee suggested "irregular PAR schedules" that come, on average, as frequently as now, along with "verbal reporting and computerized recordkeeping."

### **Career Development**

23. **Feature 5: Occupational Career Handbooks**--"Terrific idea. All employees will know what's expected of them, their counterparts, and other careerists," commented one enthusiastic supporter of this proposal. Even here, however, suspicion of "the system" was manifest, and some worried about the "potential for someone who has driven himself long and hard to fully meet the requirements for advancement in a particular occupation suddenly faced with a 'rule change' near the end of the fulfillment of these requirements when an updated handbook is published." A worry was expressed, too, as to whether "the occupational models for the lesser salaried occupations [would get] full professional attention."

24. **Feature 6: Individual Career Development Plans** were described by one employee as "another great idea," as was the notion of supervisors' being evaluated on their assistance to career development--so good, in fact, that "maybe it should be added to the AWP and PAR aspects."

25. **Feature 7: Occupation Specific Training**--"OTE must guarantee sufficient runnings of prerequisite courses for the needs of the components." And, "OTE should provide written feedback to supervisors concerning employees' satisfactory completion of required courses."

26. **Feature 8: Improved Availability of Training** was hailed as desirable. A big improvement, according to some, would be to shorten the time between signing up for a course and taking the course. Some questioned whether the Office of Training and Education (OTE) as currently organized and staffed could support the program.

27. Someone asked the obvious: "Who's going to do the work while all this training is going on? So far, every job I've ever had has been so busy that taking even one day off for training has put me even further behind." According to other respondents "supervisors should be tasked with ensuring the release of employees to scheduled courses."

28. **Feature 9: Dual Track** was applauded as a novel idea--notwithstanding the fact that it is in place in many parts of the Agency, the Directorate, and even operates in CPAS. A concern raised was the facility with which one could switch back and forth. Another employee questioned "at what time in a persons career is the decision regarding which track to take made, and who is involved in making it?"

29. **Feature 10: Promotion**--an important area, which drew only a few specific comments, largely about the undesirability of having promotion panels be beyond the Office--as one put it, "there is also great concern about the possibility of a system of ranking and promotion that oversees each occupational specialty on an Agency-wide basis."

## **Benefits**

30. **Feature 11: Flexible Benefits** were generally endorsed. A note of caution was sounded by some who suggested "some people may need direction. They may not even know what is best, much less be able to predict future needs. We believe a basic health and retirement system for all is mandatory."

31. Even the current array of benefit choices is seen as confusing, so some felt more flexible benefits would require simplified aids to help individuals make intelligent choices--"a simplified menu selection approach would be welcomed, especially by two career families."

32. Some employees wanted to ensure that "making changes to flexible benefits programs should not be limited to 'open season' type arrangements."

33. **Feature 12: Leave Conversion** got favorable reviews ... for everyone, not just SISers. "We think everyone ... regardless of pay scale should be able to carry over or save as much A/L as the employee wants so long as the required 80 hours of A/L per year are taken."

34. "I LOVE IT!" said another, "pls make every effort to save this even if all else fails." On a different note, one contingent felt "that everyone, regardless of pay scale, should be required to take at least 80 hours of vacation per year."

35. The "bird in the hand" philosophy led to the obvious rank ordering of conversion options, with sharing of sick leave the least desirable.

**Annual Leave Buy Back--Take the money and run.**

**Optional Conversion to Sick Leave--next best.**

**Sick Leave Bank** was applauded "for those who really need it." One employee endorsed "starting a program of individual employees' donating some of their annual leave to the bank even though it would not be lost." On the other hand, some asked: "What would be the incentive for people to save rather than abuse sick leave if they don't have to save for a rainy day (real medical emergencies requiring large amounts of leave?)"

One employee suggested that this be extended to care for critically ill parents and dependents.

**Home Leave Use** was suggested as "collateral on credit union loans including education for Agency employees as well as their dependents ... [or] transferred to sick or annual leave, or may be used for retirement."



36. **Feature 13: Educational Assistance for Dependents** was not universally endorsed. Some felt "such a program should not be Agency specific, but rather part of a larger federal program." One individual felt "the Agency should first worry about developing a child day care center--students can and should earn a lot of their own money for college, but infants and toddlers can't take care of themselves."

**Leave-Secured Loans** should not be limited to educational use, according to some employees; accrued leave can be collateral no matter the purpose for which an individual must borrow. "After all," said one respondent, "the premise for the flexible benefits proposals is that they be tailored to meet the varying needs of the varied population employed by the Agency."

#### **Thrift Loans**

**CIA-Subsidized Student Loans** were applauded by some. One employee felt the Agency should subsidize the rate because Agency salaries are high and therefore "many Agency employees are not eligible for government loans at 8 percent interest ... Agency could subsidize percent of differences."

37. **Feature 14: Staffing Management Tools** were seen by some as a curiosity because of the apparent cross purposes to which they seem directed: making working conditions more desirable to facilitate staying, and sweetening retirement options to foster leaving.

38. One employee asked "will it be easier ... to get rid of the rotten apples?" claiming that "at present, firing an employee is ... cumbersome." This same employee looks back with nostalgia to the days when "CIA used to be 'a lean mean machine' ... now we are famous for nurturing our employees ... [we should] consider tightening recruitment and advancement standards to balance more liberal pay and benefits."

**Early Retirement for SIS Managers**--but why just SIS managers? ask some employees.

**Early Retirement for Experts**--but why just for experts? ask some employees.

**Involuntary Retirement**

Retention Bonus raised some doubts about the specifics: one employee pointed out that, "if improperly monitored, this is a license to steal." If workable at all, some felt that, like a military bonus for "reupping," it should imply a definite time commitment for the recipient. One employee, however, stated emphatically that "the Retention Bonus is a good idea." Embellishing, another said it should be given "every year he stays on."

## **Data Processing--Planning Tools**

### **39. Feature 15: System Controls**

40. Feature 16: Projection Tools were not generally commented on; the exception was one contingent who worried about "the possibility that forecasting tools could call for a reduction in headroom. This we would not like to see. On the other hand, forecasts for increased headroom would be welcomed."

## **Conclusions**

41. "A shift from the GS system ... may not be worth the turmoil. Implementing other changes ... particularly those involving changes in the benefits package, by themselves would be worth all the effort that has gone into this proposal," points out one employee. Another termed it "a very ambitious project that has not been carefully analyzed, given the substantive impact it will have."

42. One supervisor "sensed a reluctance on the part of the ... employees to depart from the current GS system and a fear that the new system would distribute a disproportionate share of any benefits to 'fast trackers,'" and went on to observe that "many were skeptical of the Task Force's claim that all employees would end up at least as well off under the newly proposed system."

43. Some employees felt "the report emphasizes ... the higher grades (12 and above) and doesn't address the career progressions beginning at lower grades very well at all."

## **Other Ideas From CPAS Employees**

44. Liberalized Use of Sick Leave--It is suggested that rules for utilization of sick leave be liberalized to permit its use for paternity and posthospitalization maternity

leave; otherwise, newer employees who do not have accrued annual leave must take leave without pay--a monetary sacrifice they can ill afford. Further, it is suggested that sick leave be allowed for health care of a dependent (suffering from other than a contagious disease, currently the only circumstance permitting).

45. **Maternity/Paternity Leave** was also cited by another employee as an area that should be addressed, commenting that "private industry usually has a far more accommodating policy in this regard."

46. **Computational Pay Base for Benefits**--Because of our 'round-the-clock operation, several employees suggested that benefits, bonuses, etc. be computed taking into account not only base pay, but also overtime, night, holiday, and weekend differentials.

47. **Shift-Work Stress = Qualifying Service**--"Shift workers should be given retirement exemptions similar to DO overseas benefits," suggested one employee. Another elaborated: "In our office, CPAS, a large percentage of employees work rotating shifts or straight nights. Although we receive a 10-percent differential, a certain number of years on shifts should be equal to the stress a DO employee [experiences] working five years overseas. Our Medical Staff should be able to determine this equalizing factor from research on stress."

49. **Part-Time Professionals** appeared to have been forgotten in the plan, and it should be reviewed specifically to take them into account.

50. **Accountability of Managers** might be facilitated, mused one employee, if there were "some input regarding their performance from the employees they manage. How can senior management make an informed decision about lower-level managers without getting feedback from the junior levels?" Someone suggested "a formal mechanism (online questionnaire?) for subordinates to appraise objectively the performance of their supervisors."

51. **Day Care Center**, an unfulfilled promise, was reemphasized by one employee who prioritized it well above college-tuition assistance for dependents.

52. **Quality-of-Life Incentives Beyond Pay** were suggested including incentive leave, special trips, EAA credits, or tickets for child health and recreation facilities. Other nonpay incentives suggested were nonprofit activities that the Agency would sponsor, but for which the employees would pay as they go, including: health club/sports facilities; child care; travel discounts; and, upgraded cafeterias with a variety of service styles (which could eliminate the Executive Dining Room, suggested some).

53. **Special Projects, Special Bonuses**--an employee suggested that first-line supervisors be able to identify projects that will be identified with future bonuses.

STAT

cc: DD/OGI